

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto is one (1) sheet of corrected formal drawings. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

FIG. 4 is newly added to illustrate the features of the headgear and the visor.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are now present in the application. The specification, drawings, and claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 4 and 7-10 have been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

Applicant submits that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicant is responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments.

Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant has submitted one (1) sheet of corrected formal drawings and amended claims to address the Examiner's requested changes.

In particular, newly added FIG. 4 illustrates that the LED illuminator including the LED unit 3 is be located at a cap 41 with a visor 42. In addition, the features of the UV or IR LEDs are shown in FIG. 1 (see reference numeral 4).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's drawings objection are respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification has been amended to be consistent with the amendments to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is entered. Entry of the above amendments to the specification is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Becker, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0228119. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Hanley, U.S. Patent No. 6,733,150. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Lozar, U.S. Patent No. 4,298,913. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including “light emitting semiconductor light sources; a frame; and an electronics control part for controlling the semiconductor light sources, the electronics control part including a switch, wherein the semiconductor light sources are directed in a given direction or directions, wherein the semiconductor light sources are fitted in the frame, side by side and directed towards the given direction or directions, wherein the switch is arranged integrally to the frame, and wherein the switch is adapted to vary the lighting efficiency of the illuminator.” Applicant respectfully

submits that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, the Examiner referred to the means 46 of Becker as the electronics control part for controlling the semiconductor light sources as recited in claim 1. However, Becker in paragraph [0021] simply discloses that the means 46 can be a push button switch and can control the powering means 44 to selectively power to the one or more light emitter. Becker nowhere discloses that the means 46 can vary the lighting efficiency of the light emitter. Therefore, Becker fails to teach “the switch is adapted to vary the lighting efficiency of the illuminator” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, although Becker in paragraph [0021] discloses that the powering means 44 and wires 48 can be disposed internally with respect to the flexible member 12 (referred to by the Examiner as the frame), Becker nowhere discloses that the means 46 is arranged integrally to the flexible member 12. Therefore, Becker also fails to teach “the switch is arranged integrally to the frame” as recited in claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on the secondary references, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to some dependent claims. These references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Becker.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 or its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP


8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant 

Attachment: One (1) New Sheet
Substitute Specification (Clean Copy and Marked-up Copy)